

REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Hunter and Shields

The Examiner has rejected claims 48 and 51-52 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,356,623 issued to Hunter (hereinafter referred to as "Hunter") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,350,696 issued to Shields et al. (hereinafter "Shields").

The Applicants respectfully submit that these claims have been cancelled. Therefore the rejection is believed to be moot.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Hunter and Wolf

The Examiner has rejected claims 53-54 and 59-60 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter in view of Wolf et al., "Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era Volume 1: Process Technology (hereinafter "Wolf").

The Applicants respectfully submit that these claims have been cancelled. Therefore the rejection is believed to be moot.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Hunter, Wolf and Shields

The Examiner has rejected claim 56 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter in view of Wolf as applied to claims 53-54 and 59-60 above and further in view of Shields.

The Applicants respectfully submit that claim 56 has been cancelled. Therefore the rejection is believed to be moot.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Bracco and Shields

The Examiner has rejected claims 48-49, 51-52, 61-63 and 68-69 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,536,944 issued to Bracco et al. (hereinafter "Bracco") in view of Shields.

Claim 61 recites a method comprising:

"forming insulating spacers adjacent to sidewalls of a gate;

forming extension regions after forming the insulating spacers by ion implantation using the insulating spacers as a mask;

removing the insulating spacers by etching; and

forming a source and a drain by ion implantation,

wherein the extension regions are shallower than the source and the drain, and

wherein the source and the drain are more heavily doped than the extension regions".

Bracco and Shields do not teach or suggest these limitations. In particular, Bracco and Shields do not teach or suggest forming extension regions by ion implantation using the insulating spacers as a mask, and then removing the insulating spacers by etching.

Shields does not teach or reasonably suggest spacers that are used to form extension regions. In fact, Shields does not even mention extension regions or forming extension regions. Prior responses in this case elaborate on this fact.

Bracco does not teach or suggest forming extension regions after forming the insulating spacers by ion implantation using the insulating spacers as a mask. In Bracco the formation of the source extension and drain extension is shown in FIG. 4 and discussed at column 6, lines 40-57. As shown in FIG. 4, there are no insulating spacers adjacent to sidewalls of a gate when the source extension 34 and the drain extension 38 are formed. Rather, as shown and clearly discussed at column 6, lines 43-46, the second terminal edge 36 of the source extension 34 is aligned with the first sidewall 10 of the gate electrode 6.

Accordingly, claim 61 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable over Bracco and Shields. Claim 70 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable for one or more similar reasons.

The other claims have been cancelled, and therefore the rejection with respect to these cancelled claims is believed to be moot.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Bracco, Shields and Wolf

The Examiner has rejected claims 53-54 and 59-60 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bracco in view of Shields as applied to claims 48-49, 51-52, 61-63 and 68-69 above and further in view of Wolf.

The Applicants respectfully submit that claim 56 has been cancelled. Therefore the rejection is believed to be moot.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed at the earliest possible date.

Request For Telephone Interview

The Examiner is invited to call Brent E. Vecchia at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request For An Extension Of Time

The Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 for such an extension.

Charge Our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date:

7/24/06

Brent E. Vecchia

Brent E. Vecchia
Reg. No. 48,011

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030

Attorney Docket No. 42P13230D
Application No. 10/619,961

8

BEST AVAILABLE COPY